

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20215

## PRESS RELEASE, MINNESOTA MINING &amp; MANUFACTURING CO.

A program designed to give recognition to the accomplishments of creative teachers in the schools of America, was announced today by the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., St. Paul, Minn.

Called the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. creative teaching competition, the new program will offer expense-paid summer studies at the University of the Americas in Mexico City and educational tours of Mexico to teachers who demonstrate their ability to teach classroom subjects in a dramatic creative manner.

"Aventura En Mexico" is open to all U.S. teachers of any subject in any public, private, and parochial school, including primary, secondary and college levels.

"First, it is to honor those teachers who have stimulated their students through the ingenuity of their classroom presentation. Secondly, it is to bring together a body of knowledge about creative teaching and make it available to all educators. Thirdly, it will give to the winning teachers an opportunity to broaden their own knowledge with travel and study in fields of their own choice," he said.

Six grand prizes will be awarded. Each will consist of a 6-week summer course at the fully accredited University of the Americas. It will include transportation, living expenses and weekend side trips for two.

There will be 12 second prizes consisting of 2-week trips for two to Guadalajara, Mexico City, Acapulco, and other famous places.

The trips, arranged by the Mexican National Tourist Council, will include an itinerary of cultural and educational highlights of particular interest to the winning teachers.

Additionally, each of the 18 winners also will receive an overhead projector and a transparency maker for his classroom.

To become eligible for the prizes, entrants must submit a series of visuals for overhead projectors which demonstrate a teaching idea or concept. These may be entire teaching units or a portion of a teaching unit. The entries should be accompanied by a brief description of how the visuals are used.

There is no restriction on the number of entries an individual may submit. Further information and entry forms can be obtained from Thermo-Fax products dealers or directly from creative teaching competition, visual products group, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., 2501 Hudson Road, St. Paul, Minn.

Entries must be submitted by November 28. They will be judged by a panel of educators on the basis of originality of teaching techniques.

In conducting the creative teaching competition, the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. embarks upon its second major effort designed to stimulate creative teachers and promote creative teaching techniques. With a conviction that the teacher is and must remain the dominant force in the education process, the company last year awarded a \$1.5 million assistance grant to 500 U.S. schools.

Techniques drawn from that grant program also form the base of "More Effective Teaching" clinics being conducted across the country by Thermo-Fax products dealers for any teachers and administrators requesting participation.

# PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at a time when the Judiciary Committees of both the House and Senate are considering immigration reform, I would like to

call to the attention of my colleagues a letter to the editor of the New York Times from Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. In it, he states with logic and brevity the case for this legislation.

Samuel Gompers, our great American labor leader, once recalled the song which fired his imagination and desire to reach America when he was still a factory laborer in London:

To the West, to the West, to the land of the free

Where mighty Missouri rolls down to the sea  
Where a man is a man if he's willing to toil  
And the humblest may gather the fruits of the soil.

America was the "golden door," which opened onto the land of the free. And what is freedom but that situation where a man may heed the yearning of his heart—to prove his worth, to affirm his dignity, to grow to the full measure of his manhood without the crippling judgments implicit in discrimination.

America remained the symbol of freedom for many decades. The torch of liberty was a beacon to millions of immigrants who pulled free from their past, from their community, and from their traditions to build and populate a new land.

That light faltered when the national origin quota system announced to the world that opportunity was no longer open to all but rationed according to accidents of birth.

The quota system was adopted four decades ago, in a postwar climate of suspicion and hostility. These fears and prejudices coalesced to bring about restriction of immigration—fear of competition in jobs, pessimism over the possibility of continuing economic growth, and spurious sociological theories concerning the "purity" of certain ethnic groups.

It is to the everlasting credit of President Wilson that he recognized the obligation of his office to lead, not merely reflect, public opinion. In 1921, one of his final acts of office was to veto the quota law. However, it was subsequently signed by President Harding, became law, and our present version went into effect several years later.

Even had this law been equitable and wise, it would be well to review whether changing requirements and times, and our changing role in the world community, have not made some of its provisions obsolete. We must ask ourselves whether this law truly fulfills our present needs. Our best interests should not be thwarted by legal anachronisms.

Our present laws cannot be logically justified. The constant adjustments required testify to their inadequacy. We need a new and flexible system which will serve the needs of our Nation, reject discredited racial myths, make humanity and compassion acknowledged objectives of the law, and restore this Nation as a symbol of opportunity and freedom—where man's potential is not restrained by prejudice or rigid class distinctions.

The legislation now before Congress was submitted by President Kennedy. While almost every President has called upon Congress to correct the present de-

ficiencies of the law, this is the most specific and comprehensive legislation yet proposed. It is a conservative proposal despite its strong liberal backing—because the national quota system was and is a radical departure from our traditional belief in freedom of movement and equality among men.

The corrective devices in this bill are rooted firmly in experience. Where our present system has proven inadequate, unfair or unworkable, S. 1932, the proposed amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, offers practical alternatives. It will not remove the limitation on total numbers. It will admit only so many immigrants as our economy is prepared to absorb without damage to our own workers. It will, however, place emphasis on meeting our manpower needs—giving preference to those special skills, education, and training in demand in the United States. The new frontiers of science and modern technology, among others, are in need of pioneers.

This legislation would also give special attention to the reuniting of families and aid for refugees who have fled oppression or natural disaster. The new law would thus embody compassion, commonsense, and recognition of values such as cohesive family life and political freedom. The proliferation of private and special immigration legislation before each Congress makes it evident that our current system must be constantly adjusted. This bill provides for such adjustments in a practical, efficient, and prompt manner.

In a memorable speech at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, President Johnson set a goal which can serve as inspiration to all of us—the building of a "great society." A great society is not a closed society; it is open to enriching ideas and contributions of many cultures; it thrives on diversity. Immigration reform means substantial progress toward this goal. If our society sincerely judges its members on worth instead of birth, let us heed Attorney General Kennedy's advice:

The time has come for the quota system to be replaced by the merit system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter and my testimony before the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Senate Judiciary Committee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and testimony were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## TO THE EDITOR:

In a letter to the editor published August 10 William A. Turner deploras the pending administration bill to eliminate the national origins system from our immigration laws. Mr. Turner says he believes the present system is satisfactory and that in 36 years as a foreign services officer of the State Department he has never heard foreigners criticize the national origins provision of our immigration laws.

It is my firm conviction that this national origins system causes our Nation great harm both at home and abroad, and that it should be eradicated from our law.

This national origins system was conceived in a spirit of mistrust of certain racial groups, in southern and eastern Europe and elsewhere. Its original stated purpose was bald

discrimination—to preserve what was believed to be the racial and ethnic composition of our population in 1924.

This system is a blot on our relations with other countries. It violates our basic national philosophy because it judges individuals not on their worth, but solely on their place of birth—or even where their ancestors happened to be born. I know from my own experiences abroad how deeply this system hurts us. I have been asked how a country which professes that all men are equal could permit a system which treated immigrants so unequally. It is a difficult criticism to answer.

#### UNFULFILLED NEEDS

This system fails to fulfill our own needs at home. An unskilled laborer from a northern European country can come here without delay or difficulty. But a particularly well-qualified scientist, or engineer—or chef—from one of a number of other countries experiences great difficulty and long delay. Thus there are no visas now available for a Korean radiation expert, a Japanese microbiologist, a Greek chemist, a skilled teacher of the deaf from the Philippines—and many others like them. Yet all want to come here, all are needed, and all are wanted. The time has come for us to insist that the quota system be replaced by the merit system.

This system inflicts cruel and unnecessary hardship on the families of many American citizens and resident aliens. Again and again they are deprived of the chance to bring brothers and sisters or other close relatives to this country because quotas in their native countries are oversubscribed. The national origins quota system makes it easier for a man to bring a maid to this country than to bring his mother; a system which can so distort human values must be revised.

Finally—and ironically—the national origins system does not even achieve its own purposes. It assigns an overwhelming number of quota visas to the countries of northern and western Europe—which do not use them all. For example, out of about 83,000 numbers assigned annually to the British Isles, only about 32,000 visas are used.

The 51,000 unused numbers cannot be re-assigned; they are lost. Meanwhile, the quotas of many other countries are oversubscribed with the names of thousands of eligible immigrants eager to come to this country. Thus the ratio of immigration sought by the national origins system is not maintained, nor can it be.

#### SPECIAL LAWS

Further, the pressures which result from this system have forced Congress to enact special laws from time to time in recent years authorizing visas for people waiting in oversubscribed countries. The result is a further departure from the ratio which the national origins system was designed to continue.

This system damages America in the eyes of the world. It deprives us of able immigrants whose contributions we need. It inflicts needless personal cruelty on large numbers of American citizens and residents. And it doesn't work. Certainly, no plainer or more compelling arguments could be made for changing this system.

The administration's pending immigration bill seeks to change that system and establish a system that works in the national interest. It would increase the amount of authorized immigration by only a fraction—from 157,000 to 165,000. But it would, at the same time, gradually eliminate the present system and provide us with the flexibility necessary to deal with problems of fairness and of foreign policy.

Both major parties and four successive Presidents have urged a revision of the immigration laws. President Kennedy recommended this legislation to Congress and

President Johnson has firmly endorsed it. Every American should support the change.

ROBERT KENNEDY,  
Attorney General.

WASHINGTON, August 11, 1964.

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEMOCRAT, OF MINNESOTA, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO AMEND IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to appear today in support of legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. I wish to endorse both S. 747 and S. 1932. S. 747 is the bill which Senator HART introduced and I, along with 32 other Senators, had the honor to cosponsor. S. 1932 is the administration measure based on the recommendations made to Congress by our late and beloved President Kennedy.

There are differences of detail between the two bills, but I believe this is something that can be ironed out by this able subcommittee. Both bills are a long-overdue improvement that would remove a particularly unfortunate skeleton from our national closet.

Since 1924 the laws of this Nation have barred immigration from this country upon grounds that have no basis in logic, in fact, or in morality. I refer, of course, to the immigration quota system which seeks to maintain some mythical racial and ethnic purity by apportioning immigration visas among the nations of the world in proportion to the ethnic composition of our 1920 population.

From the days of Plymouth Rock and Jamestown until the early decades of this century, this country was open to immigrants of all nations who met reasonable standards of health and character. Our country became strong, vigorous, and creative as each new wave of immigration reached our shores and contributed to our melting pot its own particular talents, energies and traditions. I am proud that this is not a country of monolithic conformity; but rather is a country with a vital and vibrant admixture of many peoples, tongues and talents. These differences, I believe, have contributed to our peculiar genius for invention, for experimentation, for progress and world leadership.

The Immigration Act of 1924 and its most recent successor, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, renounced the American open door policy toward free immigration. They thus turned this country's back upon one of the wellsprings of its strength and greatness.

The first thing these laws did was to limit the total number of annual immigrants. Let me make clear that I have no quarrel with that basic policy. There is a limit upon our country's capacity to absorb new citizens. While I might disagree as to how high that limit should be, I do not advocate totally unrestricted immigration.

Today our immigration law authorizes the admission of approximately 158,000 quota immigrants from outside the Western Hemisphere is fixed at one-sixth of 1 percent of our 1920 population. Today that is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our population.

But our laws go further. They split up these 158,000 people among the various countries of the world, in proportion to the number of Americans living in 1920 who could trace their origin to a given country. As a result, by far the largest block of quota members, some 65,000 goes to Great Britain, at the expense of practically all the other countries. Particularly hard hit are the countries of Southern and Eastern Europe.

Consequently, some of the country quotas like those of Italy and Greece have become heavily oversubscribed while other countries like Great Britain do not even use half of

the quota numbers allotted to them. Since under our laws, all unused numbers are declared forfeited, less than 100,000 permits are actually used and 50,000 to 60,000 go begging.

The national quota discrimination against south and southeast Europeans is only part of the unhappy tale. Singled out for special discrimination, are the inhabitants of the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle. Here, in India, Pakistan, China, Japan and neighboring countries, live half of the earth's population. Under our immigration laws, we admit not more than 100 persons per year from each of these nations. Such discrimination is wrong.

The present law is predicated upon the theory of a racial or cultural elite. There is no such elite in those terms. There is no privilege except the privilege of ability, no privilege of race or national origin. The sooner we get rid of the nonsensical, outmoded, and aristocratic notion that some blood is better than other blood, that some skin is better than other skin, we will be better off. That is the curse of this generation, and it is driving us to a very unfortunate position in world affairs.

There are some specific differences between S. 747 and S. 1932 on how a total quota is to be determined, how allocations are to be administered, and some other details. I believe that the committee can make an appropriate resolution of these. The main point is that both bills eliminate one of the worst inequities and deceptions in the present law by authorizing the reallocation of unused quotas. Under the present law a large portion of the quotas allocated to Great Britain go unused while would-be immigrants from other countries wait years, even decades, before they can come to our shores. Both bills would reallocate unused quotas to other areas.

Neither S. 747 nor S. 1932 will eliminate all of the inequities. President Kennedy noted that in reference to S. 1932 in his message on the subject. These bills, however, do set right the most objectionable feature of our present law. This is the national origins quota system. If we can reform that, we will have made great progress toward correcting an injustice and eliminating the basis for unnecessary and unfortunate criticism of this country by the rest of the world.

I believe that the enactment of a sound bill, embodying the objectives of either of the bills noted, will go a long way toward restoring the image of the United States as a progressive and tolerant member of the international community. Equally important, it would reap great gains by reuniting many families here at home, and it would enrich and invigorate our national life through the infusion of new persons, new cultures, and new ideas.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of these measures. I shall lend all of my energies to their adoption or the adoption of an equally good bill.

#### WORLD REFUGEE REPORT—ANNUAL SURVEY ISSUE, 1964-65

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the U.S. Committee for Refugees, a private citizens committee with whose work many of us are familiar, has recently published its annual survey of the world's refugee problems. This survey, unique of its kind, gives precise information about the various refugee communities around the world and about the efforts of the intergovernmental and American voluntary agencies to meet the needs of these refugees.

To the best of my knowledge, this publication is the only place where this